UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# THE INFLUENCE OF EGYPT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAIC KOUROI AND KOURAI IN EASTERN GREECE (LATE SEVENTH-EARLY SIXTH CENTURIES B.C.)

BY

LAURA MARIA CHINERY ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Classical Archaeology.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND CLASSICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1996

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-18148-0

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: LAURA M. CHINERY

TITLE OF THESIS: THE INFLUENCE OF EGYPT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAIC KOUROI AND KOURAI IN EASTERN GREECE (LATE SEVENTH-EARLY SIXTH CENTURIES B.C.)

DEGREE: MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE WAS GRANTED: 1996

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial position thereof may be printed or other wise reproduced in any material form whatever the author's prior written permission.

11142-63 street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5W 4E4

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Influence of Egypt on the Development of Archaic Kouroi and Kourai in Eastern Greece (Late Seventh-Early Sixth centuries B.C. submitted by Laura Maria Chinery in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Classical Archaeology

Committee Chair/Examiner
Dr. E. Ann McDougall

Supervisor
Dr. Helena Fracchia

Committee Member
Dr. Alastair A. Small

Committee Member
Dr. C. Jean Campbell

August 29, 1996

ABSTRACT

Eastern Greek expansion into Egypt began in 664 B.C. with a call to arms to aid the new pharaoh of Egypt, Psammetichus I, in winning control over all of Egypt in exchange for land in which to settle. Following this, Greek merchants and traders entered Egypt with the possibility of setting up new trade networks between eastern Greece and Egypt. When merchants operating in Egypt were concentrated into Naukratis, which became the center for trade between Greece and Egypt.

From Greece came silver, wine, oil, and pottery in which these items were transported in exchange for Egyptian grain, papyrus, and linen. However, the fascination of the eastern Greeks with the older Egyptian culture resulted in artistic ideas being exported into Greece as well. By word of mouth the wonders of Egyptian art were transferred to eastern Greece; among these wonders was monumental anthropomorphic sculpture.

In examining monumental sculpture from Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes, particularly in the *kouroi* and *kourai* forms, we see Egyptian influences with each region displaying a certain aspect or aspects of the Egyptian XXVIth dynasty style.

More importantly, each region displayed a different degree of Egyptian influence which is a result of their relative distance from Egypt. Lesbos, in the north, exhibited no discernible Egyptian influence in their sculptural record while Miletus, located further south in its central coastal region, showed its influence from Egypt with the presence of monumental sculpture with subtle Egyptian features, the most prominent feature being the *kore* eyes. Rhodes, lying closest to Egypt, was the port to which Egyptian commodities would land first on their way to other Eastern Greek ports. This translated into *kouroi* and *kourai* which showed the strongest influence of all the eastern Greek states.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction ..... 1

II. Chapter One ..... 7
A. Lesbos ..... 7
B. Miletus ..... 8
C. Rhodes ..... 12
D. Reasons for Expansion ..... 13
E. Endnotes ..... 16

III. Chapter Two ..... 18
A. 664 B.C.: Arrival of the Mercenaries ..... 18
B. Naukratis ..... 21
C. Daphnae ..... 24
D. Trade ..... 25
E. Conclusion ..... 30
F. Endnotes ..... 32

IV. Chapter III ..... 35
A. Egyptian Statuary of the XXVIth Dynasty ..... 36
1. Canon of Proportions ..... 36
2. Materials ..... 37
3. Archaism ..... 37
4. XXVIth Dynasty Characteristics ..... 38
B. Eastern Greek Sculpture: Early-mid 7th cen.B.C ... 40
C. Archaic Greek Sculpture ..... 41
1. Lesbos ..... 43
2. Miletus ..... 46
3. Rhodes ..... 50
D. The Importance of Chronology ..... 54
E. The Role of Geography ..... 55
F. Endnotes ..... 58

V. Concluding Remarks ..... 61

VI. Plates ..... 63

VII. Maps ..... 73

VIII. Bibliography ..... 77

IX. Appendices ..... 80

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Front view of torso of Psammetichus I c. 664 B.C. in Brooklyn Museum no. 58.95 (Bothmer:1969: plate 22, no. 25)

2. Green schist head from a statue of King Amasis c. 560 B.C. (Aldred:1980:plate 189)

3. Archaic statuette head from Methymna (Buchholz:1975:plate 28e)

4. Profile view of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 46a)

5. Front view of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 46b)

6. Front view of head of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 47a)

7. Profile view of head of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 47b)

8. Right Profile view of Berlin 1631 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 41b)

9. Left Profile view of Berlin 1631 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 41c)

10. Front view of Berlin 1631 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976: plate 41a)

11. Front view of Berlin F724 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 42b)

12. Front view of Berlin F725 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 43b)

13. Back view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen (Richter:1968:plate 190)

14. Left Profile view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen (Richter:1968:plate 191)

15. Right Profile view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen (Richter:1968:plate 192)

16. Front view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen (Richter:1968:plate 193)

17. Front view of Richter #124 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 365)

18. Back view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in

Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 366)

19. Left Profile view of Richter #124 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960: plate 367)

20. Right Profile view of Richter #124 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 368)

21. Front view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 373)

22. Profile view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 374)

23. Back view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 375)

24. Back view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum (Richter:1968:plate 249)

25. Left profile view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum (Richter:1968:plate 250)

26. Right profile view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum (Richter:1968:plate 251)

27. Back view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum (Richter:1968:plate 252)

28. Back view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum (Richter:1968:plate 244)

29. Left profile view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum (Richter:1968:plate 245)

30. Right profile view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum (Richter:1968:plate 246)

31. Front view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum (Richter:1968:plate 247)

32. Illustration of Ionic Dress (Richter:1968:plate III a,b)

LIST OF MAPS

1. Map of Lower Egypt (from: Ancient Egypt: A Social History. by B.G. Trigger et al. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1983. fig. 4.2 p. 290.)

2. Map of Eastern Greece (from: Atlas of Classical History. by Richard J.A. Talbert. Routledge, London. 1985. p.47.)

3. Map of Eastern Aegean and the Asia Minor Hinterland (from: Atlas of Classical History. by Richard J.A. Talbert. Routledge, London. 1985. p. 33.)

4. Map of Egypt, the eastern Mediterranean and the Near East (from: Ancient Egypt: A Social History. by B.G. Trigger et al. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1983. fig. 4.1. p. 285.)

# INTRODUCTION

When we examine the Eastern Greeks who lived along the coast and on the islands of the eastern Aegean in the seventh century B.C., we see a population that has, for several reasons, decided to venture out of the confines of the Aegean to colonize, trade and explore the world around them. Two of the major factors contributing to this movement were population pressures and military pressures.[1] After the first wave of Greek settlers came over from the Greek mainland around 1100 B.C. the populations in the geographical area of coastal Asia Minor and the eastern Aegean islands grew steadily for the next 200 to 400 years.[2] The growth eventually put a drain on the local resources including food supplies. This reality motivated the eastern Greeks to look elsewhere for new sources for food, most notably, grain. The rise of the Lydian kingdom at the same time (900-700 B.C.) created external pressures on the Greek cities.[3] While the Lydians did not necessarily force the Greeks to move from the coastal area, they did restrict the areas to which the Greeks could expand. The very presence of the Lydians in the east forced the Greeks to expand either northwest to the Black Sea or south towards Egypt for colonization and trading opportunities.

For the purpose of this thesis I will be focusing my attention on the Greek expansion into Egypt which served two purposes that were mutually beneficial to both the Greeks

and the Egyptians. The first was a military purpose. In 664 B.C. Psammetichus I, pharaoh of Egypt, attempted to unify the nation of Egypt under one central rule after his successors, including his father Necho I, succeeded in cutting Egypt loose from Assyrian control and he required military aid in order to do this. Greek mercenaries, seeing this policy as a good opportunity to gain a substantial reward from the pharaoh, assisted Psammetichus in this goal. After Egypt was unified the Greeks settled into northern Egypt in two different types of communities: military settlements and trading communities.

Military settlements like that of Daphnae in the eastern Nile Delta were inhabited almost exclusively by mercenaries and served either as garrison towns or as a type of army base from which they deployed troops. The trading community or emporion is simply described by Austin as "...a community which lives on trade but does not have any civic existence of its own."[4] In other words, it is a trading town which is subject to the rule of the country or region it is located in. More often that not an emporion is formed by Greeks settling into a pre-existing community, creating a type of Greek ethnic quarter in that community. Naukratis in the seventh century B.C. is a classic example of this type of community.

I have chosen to study three eastern Greek states which participated in the expansion and settlement into Egypt: Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes. In the following chapters I

will discuss in more detail the events which eventually led the eastern Greeks to Egypt and the settlement of communities in the Nile Delta, as well as the evidence, both literary and archaeological, that we have for these settlements. This discussion will be followed by a review of the three states, Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes, in eastern Greece, in order to examine how contact and subsequent trade networks with the Egyptians had an effect on these regions in both the seventh and sixth centuries B.C..

Special attention will be paid to anthropomorphic sculpture, both male and female. By examining this form of archaeological data, this thesis will focus on a fascinating characteristic of Ancient Greek culture, which is, the ability to observe something from another culture and assimilate it into their own rather than coping it. In the case of anthropomorphic sculpture, the Greeks observed a new type of monumental sculpture when they came into direct contact with Egypt. After witnessing these new monuments in person, the witnesses translated this new form back to eastern Greece by word of mouth. In turn the Greeks chose features of these monumental Egyptian sculptures that appealed to them and suited their needs and assimilated these features into their pre-existing repetoire of Greek sculpture.

In conjunction with this exploration of artistic influences in sculpture, I will examine the relationship of

relative geographical distance from Egypt with the relative amount of Egyptian influence discernible in the art of Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes. The two types of evidence that will be used for this discussion are archaeological and literary.

I will look at the archaeological evidence from the original excavations of the Greek settlements of Naukratis and Daphnae by Petrie and Hogarth *et.al.*and their associated archaeological artifacts (architecture, pottery and weapons) in order to formulate a time frame for the appearance of artistic influence/contact and to understand the population composition of these settlements and what role each settlement had. For evidence of trade between Egypt and Eastern Greece I will look at styles of pottery and other small portable artifacts (silver coins) found in Egypt in order to confirm the existence of a trading partnership between the two regions.

The other archaeological evidence I will be examining, of course, is the anthropomorphic statuary. There has been a lot of discussion in the past about how Egypt has influenced Greece[5] in the realm of sculpture, yet, in most cases they do not focus on specific features. In this thesis I will attempt to examine the Archaic anthropomorphic statuary (kouroi and kourai) of Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes of the seventh and sixth century B.C. to determine the influences that the contact with Egypt had on specific characteristics of this artform.

In addition to the archaeological evidence, we have literary evidence available to us for this period. I would prefer to use the term 'literary evidence', rather than 'historical evidence', since outside of a handful of inscriptions from the actual period under study, the written material is all dated after the time period in question. The written materials are subject to an increased amount of hearsay and biases the further they are chronologically from the actual events; therefore these sources must be considered in conjunction with other evidence to prove their historical value. Our main literary source is Herodotus, who wrote extensively about the Greeks in Egypt. Strabo and Diodorus also briefly discuss the relations between Egypt and Greece.

I will try to use both types of evidence where possible and evaluate them for their reliability. In many cases, both archaeological and literary sources can be interpreted in many different ways and do not always give us a clear picture of the facts.

## ENDNOTES

1. Huxley:1966:56
2. Haywood:1964:196
3. Haywood:1964:140
4. Austin:1970:30
5. In the past few years there has been an extensive amount of discussion involving the volumes of Black Athena. I mention this here, for the most part, as an acknowledgement to the controversy these volumes have caused with respect to relations between Egypt and Greece. I am not a believer in Bernal's theories and find his methods to be suspect, thus falling outside the scope of this thesis.

## CHAPTER ONE

As indicated in the introduction I will examine three specific areas along the coast of Asia Minor: Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes. First, a review of the history of these areas in the late eighth and into the seventh century B.C. with particular attention on the expansion of these areas through colonization and trade is necessary. This will be followed by an examination of the factors which motivated the Greeks to expand outwards from these three areas as far north as the Black Sea and as far south as Syria.

### A. LESBOS

Just prior to the seventh century B.C. the population of the island of Lesbos began to move beyond its own coastlines, acquiring land on the coast of Asia Minor just north of the island. Boardman[1] cites this move as an example of the Greek practice of a city or island obtaining land opposite of itself. This newly acquired land or *peraia* could be in the form of a town or an unpopulated piece of real estate. The one *peraia* associated with Lesbos is Assos, which was founded by the city of Methymna (a city in northern Lesbos) possibly in the late eighth century B.C. The date of the foundation is a little unclear as it is assumed on the basis of surface pottery discovered in neighbouring Lesbian foundations in this Troad region.[2]
Unfortunately the archaeological material from Assos

itself does not concur with this, as the earliest archaeological material dates to c. 600 B.C.[3] I do not think that we should speculate any date beyond this c. 600 B.C. date which is from the site of Assos itself as the evidence becomes problematic when one tries to speculate based on evidence from other sites, several kilometers away.

Another significant move by the people of Lesbos was the colonization in the area of the Hellespont and near the Black Sea. Just prior to 700 B.C., the cities of Lesbos resettled Troy, which is located at the entrance to the Hellespont,[4] so that by the seventh century B.C. they controlled the coastline from the area north of Lesbos to Troy. From here they moved north-east and began planting settlements on either side of the Hellespont and then into the area of the Propontis. One of the new colonies along the Hellespont was Sestos.[5] There is no literary or archaeological evidence available to give us a date of the actual foundation of this city but, as it is with Assos, it is placed at this point in the time-frame of c. 700 B.C. based on the foundation dates of the settlements around it. Thus the dates should be considered with caution.

B. MILETUS

In comparison to Lesbos, Miletus was much more active in colonization and trading. At approximately the same time (late eighth century B.C.) Miletus began its

expansion to the north. Although Miletus is located on the mainland of Asia Minor, it is actually on a peninsula and thus it reflects the geographical problems of an island. One of these problems is a lack of space for population expansion. Surrounded on three sides by water, Miletus may have been in search of *peraiai* just as Lesbos was at this time.[6] Its choice was the part of the Maeander plain to the north around Priene (Herodotus VI.20). Miletus also began to take control of the commodities trade from the Aegean Sea to the Maeander river and vice versa by colonizing the islands of Icaros, Patmos, Leros and Lepsia which are to the west of the mouth of the Maeander River.[7]

The colonization of these islands, in addition to the Milesian occupation in the cities of Priene and Miletus on either side of the entrance to the Maeander river, clearly illustrates this move to control the Maeander trade route. Literary evidence for Milesian colonization of these islands is found in Anaximenes of Lampsacus.[8]

Although Miletus expanded extensively by land, its greatest expansion was across the sea by planting colonies, possibly because of the island-like geography that it had. Its geographical location also contributed to Miletus' role as the center of the Ionian colonization movement. Many Eastern Greeks used Miletus as the central port from which they sailed

to set up new colonies.[9] In this way Miletus was likened to a colonizing agency.[10]

In the first quarter of the seventh century B.C. the Milesians set up dozens of colonies in the north-east, the most significant ones being Abydos (c.680 B.C.) and Cyzicus (c. 679 B.C.) along with several sites on the southern shore of the Propontis. All of these colonies lay along the trading routes between the Black Sea and Miletus.[11] Again it is the literary sources that give us our dates. Strabo states that Abydos was founded in 680 B.C. and Eusebius suggests 679 B.C. for the foundation of Cyzicus.[12]

After these colonies were founded, in c. 625 B.C., the Milesians continued their enthusiastic colonization of the north-east as they created a second passage through the Hellespont and began planting colonies along the coast of the Black Sea including Sinope (c.630 B.C.).[13] Fortunately for us Sinope, has one of the best recorded foundation dates of this period. Herodotus, Eusebius and Pseudo-Skymnos date the foundation between 650 and 630 B.C.[14] The archaeological evidence confirms this with material (i.e. pottery sherds) dating to the last third of the seventh century B.C.[15]

The Milesian foundation in this area opened up many commercial opportunities, not only for the Milesians, but for a large portion of Greece as well. J.M. Cook

gives us a vivid picture of the results:

> "...the new colonies were able to supply Greece with commodities, and merchant seamen with regular employment. Salted fish and hide were exported, and the grain of South Russia was shipped to Greece in quantity. Some of the Ionic colonies became substantial cities; industries were developed.... Fine wines, oil, textiles, and works of delicate Greek craftsmanship were imported from the manufacturing center of the Aegean, fruit trees and vine were successfully planted - especially in the Crimea, as well, local workshops produced jewelry designed for Scythian markets or as presents to native chieftans."[16]

In the south, at the site of Al Mina, there is evidence of a Milesian presence in the seventh century B.C. This is based on vases which may be of Milesian origin. Milesian contact at Al Mina represents a significant move by Eastern Greeks to the south and begins to open up Ionia to vast amounts of influence from Near Eastern nations through trade contacts. Al Mina was a colony on the Levantine coast half-way between Ionia and Egypt. It is unclear when it was founded but it was under the control of an Aramean kingdom when the Euboeans (the first Greeks present at Al Mina) first came across it. I stress that it was never, at any time, a Milesian colony and, in fact, it predated many of the Milesian colonies by a least a century. Boardman[17] indicated that Miletus may have learned of this Syrian site through contact with the Euboeans along the eastern trade routes.

As a result of seventh century expansion, by 625 B.C. the presence of the Milesians was felt as far south and east as modern Syria and as far north as modern South Russia.

C. RHODES

Rhodes' southern Ionian location means that most of its trade and colonies are in more southern locales. Thus Rhodes' presence in places like modern Syria is more prevalent than that of either Miletus or Lesbos.

For the history of the eighth century B.C. we owe a great debt to the potters of Rhodes, as Rhodian Late Geometric pottery was used as a trade commodity.[18] The pots may have been traded for goods such as those found in the graves in the city of Kamiros on the island of Rhodes. Coldstream'[19] lists gold, silverand oriental ivories as some of the possibilities. More indirectly, ideas and styles were exchanged. In many eastern Greek states and in territories to the east and south, examples of the so-called Rhodian style pottery can be found. In turn, the Rhodian Late Geometric pots began to employ motifs that are decidedly eastern: the Tree of Life, the cable, the palm tree, human head reliefs, and several colors (reds and oranges) imitating pots from Syria, Cyprus and the Levant.[20]

As in the case of Miletus, there is evidence of Rhodian commodities at the colony in Al Mina in the form of pottery sherds.[21] From the late eighth century

the Rhodian element at Al Mina is not that great but the quantity of Rhodian pottery grows exponentially in the early seventh century B.C.[22] It is during this period that we have fragments of 'bird bowls' (wine cups), 'bird oenochoai', Al Mina jugs, 'Wild Goat vases', 'Ionian cups' and polychrome striped vases which are attributed to the workshops of Rhodes.[23]

Actual colonies belonging to Rhodes are located in the area of the Levant at Tarsus as well as at, possibly, Phaselis[24] and Soloi. Eusebius gives us a date of 688 B.C.for the foundation of Phasilis and, based on their proximity to Phasilis, Tarsus and Soloi, are also assumed to have been founded at about the same time. Tarsus is the only one of the three sites to have actual Rhodian pottery which confirms a date of the seventh century B.C.[25]

D. REASONS FOR EXPANSION

> "The primary cause of Greek colonization is usually and sensibly held to have been over-population. For this condition there were three practical solutions - to expand into neighbouring territory, to reduce the population by emigration, and to import food and other necessaries which would have to be paid for by industrial exports or by services."[26]

In the case of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes I agree with the above statement by Cook that overpopulation and the corresponding problem of food shortages in these regions was the basic cause of the expansion to the north and to the south. The need for food sources

partially explains why they expanded into the Black Sea region as this was a large grain producing area. In conjunction, the actual movement of people in the colonization process would alleviate population pressures within Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes.

The other reason why these Greeks moved to the area of the Black Sea and to the more southern regions in the Levant was the rise of the Lydian kingdom in Asia Minor.[27] King Gyges gained the throne of Lydia c. 685 B.C.[28] and under his rule the Lydians proceeded to make a favourable arrangement with the coastal and island cities of Eastern Greece and, in order to control shipping and trade, they also were able to dictate where the Greeks could colonize.[29] In addition to their commercial control, the Lydians had a limited form of military control which hindered any form of Ionian expansion into the Anatolian heartland.[30]

There was trade of other products, such as minerals (iron, copper and tin), and luxury items, such as gold and ivory, and Near Eastern pottery from Syria, Cyprus and Phoenicia.[31] Still,it is unlikely that these commodities would have provided a sufficient motive to set East Greek colonization in motion; on the other hand, the need for new food sources would have provided a more compelling motive for expansion. The trade in these secondary commodities was more likely a result rather than the cause of colonization.[32]

With new sources of food and thriving trade networks the Greeks of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes were set for even further expansion south - into Egypt.

ENDNOTES

1. Boardman:1980:85
2. Ibid
3. Graham:1982:160
4. Boardman:1980:241
5. Ibid
6. Dunham:1915:46
7. Huxley:1966:64 -These islands surround the entrance to the Maeander River which allowed the Milesians to control the traffic going in and out of this entrance to the Maeander; Cook:1964:26
8. Huxley:1966:177 (footnote 2)
9. Cook:1962:51
10. Dunham:1915:47
11. Graham:1982:119,121,123; Cook:1946:71; Drews:1976:18,24
12. Cook:1946:71 -Cook states that Abydos was founded by Miletus only after they received permission from King Gyges of Lydia; Graham:1982:160
13. Cook:1962:57 -Sinope was an excellent place from which to cross the Black Sea, which made it an important point in the Black Sea trade routes.
14. Cook:1946:72 -This is the date of the so-called second foundation of Sinope which was Milesian. There was an earlier foundation(s?) here according to Pseudo-Skymnos and Eusebius. Herodotus does not mention an earlier foundation.
15. Graham:1982:123 -"Since Greeks material does not appear in quantity in the Pontus before the second half of the seventh century, that is the time when many would put the beginning of all Greek colonization in the Black Sea." However the literature says otherwise.
16. Cook:1962:54
17. Boardman:1980:49 -Boardman indicates that the Milesians allied with the Euboeans at Al Mina to form a trading enterprise to quell competition from their rivals.
18. Coldstream:1977:246
19. Ibid
20. Coldstream:1977:246,247 -the Rhodian style includes cross-hatched ornament and maeanders. Dark glaze covers a large portion of the surface and the decoration is confined to the area above the belly of the pot in closed pot shapes and hemmed in by glaze in the open pot shapes. see pg. 249 of Coldstream for popular shapes.; Rhodian style pottery found in Halicarnassos, Iasos and Cos to the east.
21. Boardman:1980:42 -The pottery sherds are form vases which are of a type made in east Greece, especially Rhodes. Unfortunately Boardman does not indicate what style or type these sherds are.
22. Boardman:1980:46,48
23. Boardman:1980:48
24. Cook:1946:77
25. Boardman:1980:50 -There was an increased amount of Rhodian pottery in Tarsus at this time; Graham:1982:93; Cook:1982:212

26. Cook:1946:79
27. Cook:1962:50
28. Haywood:1964:140
29. Ibid
30. Cook:1962:50 -Along with the checking of the forward movement of the Ionians, Lydia, at the plain of Sardis was also able to have access to several trade routes along the Ionic coast.
31. Cook:1946:85-86
32. Cook:1946:86

## CHAPTER TWO

Evidence for artistic contact between the Ionian city-states of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes with Egypt, prior to 664 B.C., comes from small Egyptian bronze statuettes, amulets and scarabs found in these Ionian regions.[1] These objects were acquired either through direct trade between the city-states and Egypt, or more likely, through trade centers in and around Palestine, Syria, Cyprus and Phoenicia. M.M. Austin[2] stresses that there are problems with accepting these artifacts as indications of contact with Egypt as these objects are not associated with a proper archaeological context. In addition the small size of these objects allows for extensive travel between many people and places. These objects could be used in trade as a way to pay for items, in the same manner as one would use money. Thus, the same amulet could be traded a number of times during its existence. With this in mind it is very difficult to trace its original source and date of manufacture unless the artifact were actually inscribed. Therefore, the aforementioned Egyptian artifacts found in the Ionian sites are not absolute proof of contact before 664 B.C.

### A. 664 B.C.: ARRIVAL OF THE MERCENARIES

In the year 664 B.C., Psammetichus I came to the throne of Egypt and began to unify Egypt with the help of Greek mercenaries from the coast of Asia Minor. According to Herodotus,[3] Psammetichus asked the oracle of Buto how he

could achieve his goal of unity in Egypt; the oracle predicted that bronze men would come to aid him in his quest. Then, by chance, pirates wearing bronze armor, from Ionia and Caria were forced (almost supernaturally) by inclement weather to the coast of Egypt. Psammetichus, apparently upon seeing the bronze armor, determined that this was the fulfillment of the oracle and offered monetary rewards if these pirates would serve him in his cause. The question I would like to raise here is - How accidental was this Greek landing in Egypt? Was it accidental at all? Austin argues that the Greek landing in Egypt was fully planned.

> "...how did the Egyptians ensure a permanent supply of Greek troops? There is no evidence of periodic recruitments in Greece to fill gaps caused by losses or death, nor of the return to Greece of time-expired veterans from Egypt. On the contrary, Herodotus implies that the Greeks and Carians came in one single movement..." [4]

If they came over in one single movement, how many were there? This is difficult to say. We can make some sort of speculation based on later evidence. According to Herodotus,[5] during the reign of Amasis (570-526 B.C.) there were 30 000 Carian and Ionian mercenaries in Sais. If there was no later influx of Greek troops in the time of Amasis these mercenaries would have to be the grandsons of the original Greek mercenaries through intermarriage with Egyptian women.

If we follow this theory it would imply that the original

Greek mercenaries would have numbered in the thousands and this complicates the original story that Herodotus gives us of a company of mercenaries and their chance landing on the coast of Egypt. If the mercenaries numbered in the thousands they would have required a fleet of ships to travel and, if it was an accident that this army of mercenaries landed at Egypt, where were they intending to go in the first place? J.A. Fine[6] concurs with this theory by suggesting that Psammetichus, in need of soldiers to fight for the throne of Egypt, asked Ionia and Caria for help, and offered land in exchange. As a result thousands of men answered this challenge from western Asia Minor.

The other possibility here is that there was an influx of Greek troops at the time of Amasis, of which we have no evidence, eliminating the unlikely scenario of intermarriage between Egyptian women and Greek troops.

However many there were, the reward for service to the pharaoh was land to settle. Herodotus[7] identifies the two places where the mercenaries settled as areas called the "Camps" or Stratopeda. The "Camps" were situated on either side of the Pelusian branch of the Nile lying seaward from the city of Bubastis. There seems to be a little confusion in the literature as to what seaward means. Reading Herodotus' account the first impression, based on his use of the word meaning towards, is that the "Camps" are located north of Bubastis along the Pelusian branch of the Nile towards the Mediterranean Sea.[8] But Austin's

interpretation[9] indicates that the "Camps" are located south of Bubastis on the Pelusian branch; this interpretation is matched[10] in Diodorus' account. Is the sea they are referring to the Red Sea? Neither Austin nor Diodorus gives the name of the sea.

Wherever those Camps were located, all indications are that the Greeks were well treated by Psammetichus and that, as foreigners, they received honors that were uncommon in Egyptian history. According to Diodorus Siculus:

> "...among the mercenaries he distributed notable gifts over and above their promised pay, gave then the region called The Camps to dwell in, and apportioned to them much land in the region lying a little up the river from the Pelusiac mouth [...] and since Psammetichus had established his rule with the aid of the mercenaries he henceforth entrusted these before others with the administration of his empire [...] he gave the mercenaries more honorable place in his order of battle by putting them on the right wing."[11]

B. NAUKRATIS

The next significant event involving the Greeks in Egypt was the settlement of Naukratis. There is much debate as to when the Greeks settled in Naukratis. I will use the word settlement because it is important to note that Naukratis was not founded by the Greeks but settled by the Greeks.[12] There is evidence of an earlier Egyptian city on the site of Naukratis and thus the Greeks did not 'found' it.[13]

The literary sources provide different dates for the arrival of the Greeks. Strabo states that the Greeks

arrived during the reign of Psammetichus I,[14] while Eusebius and Diodorus[15] give us dates as far back as the eighth century B.C. Herodotus,[16] who is our primary literary source, tells us that the Greeks settled the area of Naukratis during the reign of Amasis (570-526 B.C.).[17]

The archaeological evidence tells a different story. While the bulk of the Greek pottery dates from Amasis' reign (570-526 B.C.)there are fragments which date back to c. 620 B.C. These include a Corinthian 'Transitional' vase (c.620 B.C.), Athenian black-figure vases (c. 620-600 B.C.) and some Rhodian ware ('Wild goat vases') (late seventh century B.C.).[18] The increased amount of Greek pottery in Naukratis during Amasis' reign may, in large part, be due to Amasis' known policy of concentrating Greek merchants and traders in Naukratis from other towns and settlements in the Nile Delta, thus Greek pottery imported from Greece had to pass through Naukratis. Reasons for having this concentration of Greeks and Greek products will be discussed below.

We should not think of Naukratis as a strictly Greek-populated town. Based on the 1898 excavations there appears to be an Egyptian quarter in the southern part of the town. Hogarth[19] states that only Egyptian remains were found there and that the Greek population was limited to the northern area of the town. He does not indicate, however, if there were any Egyptian artifacts in the Greek quarter thus we do not know the extent of contact between Egyptians and Greeks

within Naukratis or if there was any at all.

After the Greeks settled in Naukratis in the seventh century B.C., the settlement fell under the category of an emporion or trading community. Naukratis, being an emporion, the rights and privileges of the Greeks who lived there were determined by the pharaoh. This situation is spelled out clearly in Herodotus:

> "In old days Naucratis was the only port in Egypt for the Greeks, and any one who brought a ship into any of the other mouths of the Nile was bound to state an oath that he did so of necessity and then proceed to the Canopic mouth. Should contrary winds prevent him from doing so, he had to carry his freight to Naucratis in barges all round the Delta which shows the exclusive privilege the port enjoyed."[20]

But the Pharaoh did not concede Naukratis to the Greeks without forethought, as the location of Naukratis was also a form of control over the Greeks. Firstly, as Kees points out, Naukratis was on the Canopic branch of the Nile in the western Delta. Being in the western Delta, the Greeks were prevented from having direct access to the Asiatic countries, like Phoenicia and Syria, on the eastern Delta.[21] The Egyptians, therefore, kept the Asiatic trade for themselves. Secondly, Naukratis was in the Saite province. The Saite province with its capital of Sais, was the national capital of the twenty-sixth dynasty.[22] By placing the Greeks here the Egyptians could keep a close eye on both the Greek trading activities and the extent of the association with the native Egyptians.[23] In fact, in the

Egyptian quarter of the town, a large structure has been excavated that was considered to be a fort for an Egyptian garrison to observe Greek activities in Naukratis.

The fact that Naukratis was an emporion indicates that the majority of the population were merchants and traders of some sort who may have come to Egypt shortly after the mercenaries did[24] and were looking for new products and customers for their businesses.

Overall, the importance of Naukratis cannot be underestimated as Naukratis was the only Greek settlement in Egypt for several hundred years until the foundation of Alexandria. During this time Naukratis was the center of the transfer of artistic influences between the Greeks and Egyptians.[25]

C. DAPHNAE

The other major Greek settlement in the Nile Delta in the late seventh-century B.C. was Daphnae.[26] During the original excavations of Daphnae by Petrie[27] the possibility was raised that Daphnae and the Stratopeda, mentioned by Herodotus, were one and the same. This hypothesis is apparently based on the presence of iron weapons and the fact that they are described as being roughly in the same regions.[28] This theory has been rejected by later authors.[29]

Unlike Naukratis, Daphnae had a strong military role during its existence since its primary inhabitants were Greek and Carian mercenaries.[30] The military function is

further demonstrated by the presence of a fort which contained bronze and iron weapons and iron scale-armour.[31] Petrie has hypothesized that a large square structure, found in the 1886 excavations, was a fort which could hold up to 20 000 mercenaries.[32] Boardman[33] does not agree with this hypothesis stating that there is not enough archaeological evidence to prove this, although he does agree that Daphnae had a largely military function based on the presence of the military weapons. The military role is also spelled out for us in the literature. Herodotus[34] tells us that the Egyptians set up a garrison at Daphnae during the reign of Psammetichus to defend the eastern Delta from the Arabians and Syrians, presumably employing the Greeks and Carians to operate this garrison.

Again, like Naukratis, the date of the first settlement is based partially on literature (as indicated by Herodotus above) and by pottery.

D. TRADE

At this point I will focus in on the three specified regions and evidence of their trading relationship with Egypt.

With the settlement of Greeks in Naukratis, in particular, there was a well established trade link between Egypt and the Ionian Greeks. As stated earlier, one of the most important products exported from Greece was pottery. One of the difficulties with the pottery record is that the only detailed catalogues were compiled at the turn of the century

after the original excavation and the contexts of the pottery were not identified at the time.

Identified pottery from the island of Rhodes is primarily the Fikellura vases which date to 575-550 B.C. Also mentioned are the Vroulian cups dating from 575-525 B.C. and Rhodian oinochoae.[35] The Fikellura vases come in a wide range of forms (jugs, bowls and plates)[36] but in Naukratis, more often than not, they are found in the form of amphorae or hydriae for the shipping of olive oil, wine and other unidentified liquids.[37] These vases are generally decorated with a white slip with dark brown glaze for the decoration. Figures such as wild goats, birds and, occasionally, the more eastern sphinx, along with floral and other similar designs, were drawn partly in outline with this dark brown glaze.[38] No incision is used. The common decoration of the wild goats indicates why this type of vase is also known as the 'Wild Goat' style. The Rhodian oinochoae are similar in style and decoration to the Fikellura vases.[39] A form of Rhodian pottery found at Daphnae and not Naukratis is the situlae dating between 570-530 B.C.[40] - a type of storage jar.

Identification of 'Milesian' pottery at Naukratis has proven to be very problematic, as no one has been able to define a specific 'Milesian' style of pottery.[41] If there indeed is a Milesian element within the Naukratite pottery record, the "...vases [are]in a style which is still hard for us to distinguish from Rhodian,".[42] The reasons for

accepting some of this Rhodian-like pottery as Milesian are based on the principle that Miletus was in the forefront of trade in so many places that the Milesians must have been leaders in trade with Egypt as well and "...[w]hen [we] know more [about Milesian pottery), it seems likely that the Milesian share will be recognized at the expense of the Rhodian."[43] The validity of this statement can certainly be questioned, as I do not see any reason why Rhodes could not have been the major Greek partner in trade with Egypt since their southerly location was a more suitable location for trade with Egypt.

Pottery from Lesbos came strictly in the form of a grey bucchero ware (late seventh and early sixth century B.C.) some of which is inscribed.[44] Edgar[45] has identified inscriptions on two pots of this ware as being in the Lesbian dialect.

Both literary and archaeological evidence is available for the export of Greek pots and their contents.[46]

The most valuable import for Egypt from Eastern Greece was silver. The value of silver was very high due to the lack of available resources in Egypt. The Greek traders brought silver to Egypt mainly in the form of coins.[47] Hoards of these coins have been found at Naukratis, Daphnae and even Memphis.[48] Attempts have been made to judge the importance of Eastern Greece as a trading partner to Egypt by the amounts of silver coins found in these hoards.[49] It seems, on the basis of this evidence, that Thrace and Macedon were

the most prolific traders with Egypt,[50] although coins from Miletus, for instance, are present to a lesser degree. Still, if we look more closely at the literature and other archaeological evidence, we know this is not the case.

> "We know that in the Archaic Age the East Greeks played the leading role in trade with Egypt but their coins are scarce in the hoards, and some cities (e.g. the cities in Rhodes) are not represented at all. It has been plausibly suggested [...] that they were the carriers of the coins from Thrace and Macedon."[51]

J.G. Milne offers us a reasonable explanation. The Egyptians wanted the silver and the Ionians, being well aware of this, had access to silver resources in Thrace. What the Ionians did then was set up a triangle of trade. The Thracian tribes traded silver for the manufactured goods of the Ionians and then the Ionians traded the silver to the Egyptians for grain.[52]

Of the three: Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes, Miletus was the only Ionian Greek region that has coins present within these coin hoards.[53]

In exchange for the above-mentioned commodities, grain was exported from Egypt.[54] The need for corn from Egypt was for the same reasons that Ionian Greek states, like Lesbos and Miletus, expanded into the Black Sea area. The rapid population growth of the Ionian Greek states, as well as external military pressures from Lydia which prevented cities of Lesbos and Miletus from expanding to the east, pushed the Ionians to the Black Sea and south to Egypt for grain sources.[55] Of course, grain was not the

only import from Egypt. Literary evidence attests to the importation of linen and papyrus[56] as well as rarer commodities like bronze statuettes and faience scarabs and beads.[57]

The height of this trade came during the reign of the pharaoh Amasis (570-526 B.C.). Although Amasis came to the throne as an opponent of the Greeks, as his reign continued he had a change of heart and used the Greek mercenaries to his advantage.[58] He formed a garrison around the capital of Memphis made up exclusively of these Greek mercenaries.[59] Archaeological evidence for this event is the dramatic increase in East Greek pottery around Memphis during this reign.[60] It was the establishment of Greek garrisons, like the one at Memphis, which created a feeling of resentment towards the Greeks by the native Egyptians and forced Amasis to gather the Greek merchants and move them all to Naukratis from around Egypt. Carl Roebuck disagrees with this because there is a presence of East Greek pottery dating to Amasis' reign found at various points in Egypt;[61] thus he states that the Greek merchants were not confined to Naukratis at this time. I disagree with him on this point. Roebuck is looking at Naukratis as the final stop for the eastern Greek commodities. I think one has to look at Naukratis as the mid-point of the journey for these commodities. The Greek commodities entered into Naukratis and were exchanged for Egyptian commodities and the Greek commodities were then passed on to the source of the Egyptian commodities to

complete the trade. The merchants in Naukratis would have acted strictly as middle-men in this equation. Since Greek commodities like wine and olive oil were already transported to Egypt in the Greek amphorae and other transport vessels, it is logical to assume that the commodities continued to be transported in the same Greek vessels to various places in Egypt. This is how eastern Greek pottery turns up in many places throughout Egypt.

While one reason for this re-location of the Greeks to Naukratis was to keep the Greeks out of the xenephobic Egyptian eye[62] at this time, it may also have been a multi-purpose decision as well. According to Haywood:

> "Their trading brought wealth to Egypt, they helped him keep in touch with affairs in the world outside, and they also kept in touch with sources of mercenary soldiers."[63]

Along with this the Greeks in Naukratis offered the pharaoh a new source of revenue in the form of taxes. The evidence to this is found in the Naukratis Stela:

> "...the tithe of the gold and of the silver and of all they which are produced in Pi-rem-oye called [Nau] kratis on the bank of 'Anu, and which are reckoned to the King's Domain, to be a temple-endowment of my mother Neith, for all time in excess of what has existed formerly."[64]

Thus a form of tax was being extracted from the residents in Naukratis c.380 B.C. It is reasonable to assume the same taxes were being extracted as far back as the seventh-sixth century B.C.

E. CONCLUSION

In the period between 664 B.C. and 525 B.C. the settlement of the Nile Delta region in Egypt had changed drastically. Most notable was the settlement of Greek merchants in Naukratis and the Greek mercenary garrison in Daphnae. The Greeks introduced foreign items via trade but what they received in return was more than just commodities; they received artistic influences as well.

The impact of these influences will be explored in the next chapter.

ENDNOTES

1. Boardman:1980:111; Austin:1970:13
2. Austin:1970:13
3. Herodotus II.153
4. Austin:1970:18
5. Herodotus II.163
6. Fine:1983:84 -"The men who flocked to Egypt,then were part colonists and part soldiers, and formed a continuing army which the pharaoh could employ in addition to the sometimes unreliable class of native warriors."
7. Herodotus II.154
8. The majority of the literature accepts this translation.
9. Austin:1970:19 -"As a reward for their help they were settled in opposite 'camps', with the Nile flowing in between them, on the eastern (Pelusian) branch of the river, near the sea and a little below Bubastis."
10. Diodorus:I.66-67
11. Diodorus:I.66-67
12. Austin:1970:22 -The reasons Austin gives for stating that the Greeks did not found the city of Naukratis are the existence of an earlier Egyptian community here. Permission of the pharaoh was needed to settle here so there could be no 'autonomous foundation' by the Greeks, and "...Naukratis had no proper metropolis and its establishment did not constitute a deliberate act of policy by the founding states."
13. Ibid -Austin's view is contrary to early archaeological beliefs that Naukratis was founded by the Greeks. This is based on W.M.F. Petrie 1885:202
14. Strabo 8.17.I.18; Austin:1970:23; Milne:1939:179
15. Diodorus VII.11; Eusebius II.81.
16. Herodotus II.178-179
17. Fine:1983:85 -Fine says that Herodotus is definitely wrong in attributing it to the reign of Amasis as remains are older than Amasis' reign.
18. Boardman:1980:121-122 -The pottery evidence indicates a Greek settlement before 600 B.C.; Austin:1970:60 -footnote 8; Cook:1937:228
19. Hogarth:1898:43, Roebuck:1951:213 -Based on Hasebroek who states that the city was divided into two classes of people citizens and traders, and the traders had jurisdiction
20. Herodotus II.179
21. Kees:1961:207
22. Kees:1961:207
23. Fine:1983:85 -Increased hostility towards Greeks by Egyptians during this period. May have felt better to confine Greeks to one area.; Hogarth:1898:43
24. Austin:1970:27-33; Roebuck:1951:213-216; Fine:1983:84; Roebuck:1951:218 -The original Milesians were made up of mercenaries and probably had a limited role in the trading role of Naukratis itself. The Greek states which are considered to have made up the bulk of the population in

Naukratis were Chios, Teos, Phocaea, Clazomenae, Mytilene, Rhodes, Cnidus, Halicarnassus and Phaselis. This group of city-states also represents the founders of the Hellenion which is the political entity that governed the affairs of Naukratis that did not fall under the responsibility of the pharaoh.
25. Fine:1983:85 -Thus archaizing styles of the Saite period entered Greece.
26. Austin:1970:20; Boardman:1980:135; Cook:1937:229
27. Petrie:1885
28. Cook:1937:234
29. Cook:1937:230
30. Austin:1970:20
31. Austin:1970:20
32. Austin:1970:20 -Because of its size, Daphnae was considered to be an important community. Important enough to have local pottery manufacture.
33. Boardman:1980:133 -Boardman feels there is not enough evidence of late seventh century pottery to prove that there was a community of substantial size at Daphnae during the reign of Psammetichus at any rate. Unfortunately Boardman is not clear as to whether he believes that there may have been a population around 20 000 at a later date.
34. Herodotus II.30
35. Boardman:1980:122-124 -types of pottery; Richter:1980:310 -dates of pottery.
36. Richter:1980:310-311
37. Boardman:1980:124
38. Richter:1980:310-311
39. Richter:1980:310-311
40. Boardman:1980:133-134
41. Boardman:1980:49,122
42. Boardman:1980:49
43. Boardman:1980:122
44. Edgar:1899:47-57
45. Edgar:1899:47-57
46. Austin:1970:36-37 -At both Naukratis and Daphnae, Chiot amphoras were found, at Daphnae many amphoras were "sealed with cartouches of the reigning pharaoh". The Egyptians may have been re-using the amphoras for their own purposes; Boardman:1980:129; Milne:1939:177
47. Boardman:1980:130
48. Austin:1970:38 -There is a definite concentration of silver coin hoards in the Nile Delta.
49. Boardman:1980:130
50. Austin:1970:39
51. Austin:1980:40
52. Milne:1939:179
53. Milne:1939:179
54. Milne:1939:177 -This is the only commodity shipped to Greece in any great quantity.
55. Boardman:1980:12
56. Austin:1970:36

57. Boardman:1980:129
58. Haywood:1964:134
59. Ibid
60. Cook:1937
61. Roebuck:1951:214
62. Haywood:1964:134
63. Ibid
64. Gunn:1943:58-59

## CHAPTER THREE

In the early sixth century B.C., as the Greek traders and merchants settled into Naukratis and Greek mercenaries were posted at Daphnae, or Memphis or were marching throughout Egypt on various campaigns for the pharaoh, they were exposed, in one way or another, to the monumental art and architecture of Egypt.[1]

In the previous chapter we examined the Eastern Greek material finds in Naukratis and Daphnae which point to a trade link between these Greek settlements in Egypt and the eastern Greek states of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes. In addition to the material goods passing between Egypt and Greece, it appears that artistic ideas were also passed between them. This interchange of ideas is widely acknowledged, but has not been analyzed in the details of the type and extent of those artistic influences. In order to examine this transference of artistic ideas I will focus on the state of monumental anthropomorphic statuary in the regions of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes, and discuss how much influence Egyptian models may have had on them. In addition to this I will examine what I feel is a crucial question for this study: what impact did relative geographic distance from Egypt have on the statuary record of these three eastern Greek states.

Before investigating these questions I would like to define the parameters of the eastern Greek sculpture I will be examining for this study. Since there is more than one

form of Greek sculpture in the late seventh century B.C. and early sixth century B.C., it will be necessary to narrow down the field significantly.[2] I am going to limit the study too life-size or larger male statues of the *kouros* form and the female statues of the *kore* form for two reasons: first, both of these are forms found in eastern Greece during the period under study and secondly, these forms have Egyptian counterparts in which to do a comparative study.[3]

The *kouros*-form can simply be defined as a standing, nude male youth, with a frontal pose and one leg (usually the left) advanced. The arms are either handing by the sides with clenched fists or with their palms laid flat against the thighs.[4] The *kore*-form is simply a draped female figure with a frontal pose with the legs placed together and the arms hanging by their sides or with one arm placed on the chest holding a votive offering.[5]

A. EGYPTIAN STATUARY OF THE XXVIth DYNASTY

In order to determine what artistic sculptural ideas were transferred from Egypt to Greece we should look at the sculptures that most likely would have been seen by the Greeks in their contact with Egypt, specifically, royal sculpture, and some of the technical and cultural forces behind them.

1. Canon of Proportions

The basis of all Egyptian sculpture for centuries was the canon of proportions.[6] This canon was essentially a grid in

which the major anatomical features were placed at specific points; very much like a 'blue print'.[7] This grid could be applied to various sizes of stone or other material by altering the basic unit size of the grid. Thus the figures could appear in a variety of sizes but their proportions were all relative to one another.

For the period in question (seventh-sixth century B.C. or XXVIth dynasty) a change in the canon of proportions appeared. Since the time of the first dynasty in Egypt (c. 2900 B.C.) the canon for standing figures was made up of 18 units. In the XXVIth dynasty (c. 664 B.C.) the number of units of the standing figure is increased to 21 1/4 units.[8]

2. Materials

The Egyptians used a variety of materials for their sculptures. In the XXVIth dynasty, full-size statues were sculpted in stone such as alabaster, basalt, granite, limestone and slate.[9] The use of these hard stones, cut with copper tools, contributed to one of the most striking characteristics of Egyptian sculpture, in that, you can see four definite sides to the statues which connect to one another at right angles, very much like the original block of stone.[10] Smaller statuettes were made from faience, clay and wood.[11]

3. Archaism

In conjunction with the change in the canon of proportions, after Psammetichus I gained the throne in 664 B.C., an archaising process over Egyptian art began. The

Saite kings, as a result of the Ethiopian domination in the previous dynasty, encouraged a return to the styles of the Old Kingdom art in Egypt.[12]

It has been suggested that this archaising movement was sponsored by the Egyptian government as a way to cleanse Egyptian culture from the recent memories of foreign domination by returning to the ideals of what they considered the golden age of Egyptian history - the Old Kingdom.[13] However, in the process of making later copies of much earlier originals, frequently the character of the originals are lost. What occurred with the XXVIth dynasty copies of Old Kingdom statues is analogous to the numerous Roman copies of Greek originals: while they are technically sound they lack the personality and subtleties of the originals.

4. XXVIth Dynasty Characteristics

As a result of this concentration on technical renderings in monumental sculpture, definite stylized characteristics specific to the XXVIth dynasty emerged.

In the IVth dynasty (c.2900 B.C.), or Old Kingdom sculpture, the fingers, toes, arms and torso are modeled sufficiently to appear realistic. In the XXVIth dynasty (c. 664 B.C.) sculpture the bodies are smoothed out with only minimal definition to indicate the anatomical parts (see fig. 1). The treatment of the face is different in the two periods as well. In the faces of the IVth dynasty (c. 2900 B.C.) sculptures long, carved strips were used to deliniate

the brow line. In the XXVIth dynasty the use of carved strips to indicate the brow line is reduced and the brow is marked more often by a sharp junction between the surface of the forehead and the surface above the upper orbital ridges. The brow line is also lengthened so that it begins at the bridge of the nose and stretches across the face almost to the temples.[14] In several cases the familiar cosmetic line that extended out from the distal edges of the eyeball has been significantly reduced in comparison to earlier statues (see fig. 2).[15]

The Egyptian wig in the XXVIth dynasty became increasingly simplified, as did the costume. Where, earlier, the Egyptians had concerned themselves with decoration in the wig and in the rendering of folds in the drapery, in the late period these characteristics also became significantly smoothed out and simplified.[16]

Another notable characteristic is the presence of an archaic smile in XXVIth dynasty sculpture. Smiles do not generally appear in Old Kingdom (c. 2900 B.C.) faces.[17] In addition to the smile there was an attempt, in Old Kingdom sculpture, to portray the face of an actual individual. whereas the XXVIth dynasty sculpture used a conventional[18] or generic face.

The overall affect is that:

> "Compared with the Old Kingdom [statues], an almost tangible coldness emanates from the statue[s] of [the XXVIth dynasty], in which every impulse of warm life is frozen into mere form."[19]

While this 'cold' quality of the XXVIth dynasty sculpture can be linked to the fact that it was a technical copy of an earlier form, it is also due in part to the fact that many statues from this period were the work of stone-cutters (technicians) and not sculptors (artists).[20]

These stone-cutters, employed by the pharaoh, would have cut these sculptures to promote the archaising process of the Saite period rather than allowing actual sculptors to create truly original works of art. Both literary evidence (Egyptian tales) and archaeological evidence (tomb of Ibi) suggest that ancient tombs of the Old Kingdom were opened during the XXVIth dynasty period in order that the stone-cutters could copy from funerary originals.[21]

The result is that:

> " the figures are abstractions not dressed in the costume of the day, and lacking entirely the deep, human sympathy of the products of the dynasties IV and V. They betray the sculptor's intense concern with problems of design and artistic from, rather than with content."[22]

B. EASTERN GREEK SCULPTURE: EARLY-MID SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.

Eastern Greek anthropomorphic sculpture in the early seventh century B.C. was dominated by the Daedalic style named after the legendary Greek sculptor Daedalus.[23] This style is characterized by flat heads with low foreheads and triangular faces in which the face is wider at the temples and then is angled down to form a pointed chin.[24] Male figures in the Daedalic style are presented in two standard poses: the standing nude with the left leg advanced, and the

draped seated figure,[25] while the female figures are represented in one standard pose - standing, draped and frontal. For the most part the earliest forms of the Daedalic style were small statuettes of clay and ivory, but exceptions do exist. The most notable is the Nicandre dedication found on Delos, but generally these larger full-size statues were not produced in any great number before the middle of the seventh century B.C.[26]

C. ARCHAIC GREEK SCULPTURE

The limited production of Daedalic style sculptures gave way to an increase, numerically speaking, of Archaic sculpture in the late seventh and sixth centuries B.C.. Both the increased production of life size sculpture and the evolved style can, in part, be traced to the eastern Greek expansion into areas in the north and south bringing more wealth to the eastern Greek states, as well as to contact with Egypt which opened the Greeks up to a wave of artistic ideas.

That said, we should not get carried away with the idea that the Egyptians wholly influenced the Greek sculptures of the Archaic period. Just a simple survey of the sculptural evidence will illustrate several differences between the Egyptian style and Archaic Greek style. The most obvious difference between the standing male *kouroi* statues of the Greek Archaic Period and their Egyptian counterpart is nudity. Egyptian male sculpture normally wear, at minimum, a loin cloth. Another basic difference is seen in the

anatomical emphasis. For example, in the Greek *kouros* the anatomy in the torso, back and knees is indicated by sharp ridges and incision lines.[27] Instead the Egyptians used the technique of modeling the features (even if this modeling is minimal in the XXVIth dynasty sculpture) which created less abstraction in the sculpture.[28]

Still the Egyptian styles did make an impact on the Greeks in the form of selective imitation. In other words, the basic forms of the human figures were born in Greece with the Daedalic style, but after contact with Egypt in the mid-seventh century B.C., it is evident that the Greeks selected characteristics in the Egyptian sculptures which appealed to them, such as monumentality, or those which suited their needs in terms of physical representation.[29]

In addition to the physical characteristics a common thread may also be found in the generic aspects evident in the two groups of sculpture.

While the reasons for the generic aspects in the Egyptian sculpture was a result of political and economic forces,[30] the same generic aspects could be seen in Greek sculpture, but were a result of the "...two most essential aesthetic principles..." in Greek art: the analysis of forms into their component parts, and the representation of the specific in the light of the generic.[31] According to Pollitt, these two principles are the basis for Greek Art during the period in question, that is, the late seventh and early sixth centuries B.C..[32] The first principle of

'analysis of forms into their component parts' is the process by which the Greek artist took a subject, such as the human figure, with infinite variety, and reduced the figure to its simplest component parts. In the human figure these parts are the legs, arms, eyes, hair etc... Coinciding with this concept is the second principle of creating a 'specific [image] in the light of a generic [image]'.[33] Consequently, the Greeks would create a generic human form that could represent any number of individuals and greater specificity thus resulted from the circumstances or context in which these statues were used. In effect, although the Egyptians and Greeks approached the depiction of the human figure from different perspectives, the result was similar.

The importance of Egypt as a source for artistic influence on eastern Greek sculpture cannot be underestimated, bearing in mind that the eastern Greek states were relatively young and thus more receptive to outside Egyptian influences, whereas western mainland Greece had a longer-standing indigenous sculptural tradition from which to draw.[34] Thus, on the whole, eastern Greek archaic sculpture exnibits more pronounced Egyptian characteristics than we see in examples from western Greece.

1. Lesbos

My primary consideration in choosing the three eastern Greek areas of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes was to answer the secondary question of how relative geographical distance from Egypt affected the degree of Egyptian influence in the

area. Unfortunately, in the case of Lesbos, the examination of the primary purpose of the thesis, to determine the Egyptian influence on the sculptural record, can not be studied to the extent that I had hoped. A combination of several factors leaves us with no substantial sculptural record from Lesbos in the Archaic period, monumental or otherwise.

One factor is that the archaeological record of Lesbos is incomplete. Very little archaeological excavation has been conducted on Lesbos and, none of it focused on the Archaic period. The major excavations conducted on Lesbos were at prehistoric and Bronze Age Thermi (1929-1930) by W. Lamb and R.W.Hutchinson.[35] Classical and Hellenistic (c. 500-200 B.C.) Methymna (1964-1973) by H. Buchholz *et.al.* and Classical Lesbos (early 1990's) by Hector Williams.

A second factor is that Lesbos showed relatively little overseas commercial or colonial activity in comparison to other eastern Greek states that lie further south.[37] Although this is an argument *ex silentio* it may be that Archaic Lesbos was not particularity wealthy and was not therefore in a position to commission substantial numbers of statues. While cities like Miletus had wealth coming in from several colonies to the north and south of eastern Greece, Lesbos did not have this same sources of income. On the whole, the cities of Lesbos were more concerned with their domestic issues than with contact with the outside world.[38] If this is the case, it indicates that Lesbos'

connection with Egypt at this time was not consistent with the general trend. One has to wonder how involved Lesbos was with the settlements at Naukratis and Daphnae and whether their connections were somewhat superficial with Egypt. We do not know of extensive trade between Egypt and Lesbos specifically. As indicated in chapter two, the only commodity the Lesbian cities were trading was grey-bucchero ware and whatever these transport vessels contained. What particular commodity they received in exchange from Egypt is unclear. We know that Egypt, in general, exported grain, linen, and papyrus to eastern Greece. Of these three commodities the grain would be the most vital, especially for an island whereas other items are considered luxuries. Yet, one would have to ask why Lesbos would be trading with Egypt for grain when they were much closer to the Black Sea sources of grain.[39]

According to Herodotus, Naukratis was a commercial center for the Greeks. Herodotus statues that the Aeolians of Mytilene were part of the 'Settlement of Greeks'. Thus we are led to believe that merchants from Lesbos were present.[40] We cannot be sure that the Lesbian contingent of merchants in Naukratis consisted only of a handful of traders working on a much smaller scale than merchants from Miletus and Rhodes. Herodotus does not say that they were a major component, in fact, the manner in which they are mentioned would indicated that they were a minor (and unusual) component of the Greek settlement.

From the archaeological evidence, it would appear there was a minimal degree of contact between Egypt and Lesbos. In turn we would expect little discernible Egyptian influence on Lesbian sculpture in the Archaic period.

When we look at the sculptural record of Lesbos we see no representatives of life size *kouroi* or *kourai* and, in the few sculptural examples that we do have from the sixth-century temple in Assos and small statuettes from Methymna, Egyptian characteristics are not visible.

One fragment of sculpture we have is a small, badly preserved head of a male statuette from Methymna, now in the Louvre (Nr. b 194) (see fig. 3).[41] This head has been dated to the Archaic period but no more specifically than that.[42] The facial features are not clear due to a lot of weathering of the surface but although the headdress indicated influences from Anatolia,[43] there is no feature in this statuette that would suggest any Egyptian influence.

4. Miletus

Unlike Lesbos, Miletus was sending out colonies during the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.[44] As stated in chapter two, we know from literary and archaeological evidence that the Milesians had more extensive trading ties with Egypt.[45] Furthermore, they had set up several colonies in the Black Sea area and southwards along the coast of the eastern Aegean. Between 800 and 300 B.C. we know of at least 30 colonies for which Miletus was either the primary or associate mother city.[46] J.M. Cook states that the Latin

authors "...push this number up to between 75 and 90..."; however, this may be an exaggeration.[47] Whatever the number, Miletus had a large number of colonies which translated into a great deal of wealth flooding in, courtesy of these colonies.[48] Along with this influx of wealth and as a result of the colonial network, artistic stimulus from Egypt also is more evident in Miletus as monumental sculpture began to be produced in this period.

Our best example of the *kouros*-type sculpture from Miletus is Berlin 1710[49](see fig. 4-7). Richter has placed this *kouros* with her Melos Group which dates between c. 550 and 540 B.C..[50] Berlin 1710 is preserved from the head to just below the right knee at as height of 1.64 m. The eyes and mouth are defined for the most part by line. Minimal amounts of modeling produced a 'flatness' to the face. This 'flatness' is particularly evident in the profile of the face, as the muscles around the cheekbones are not properly rounded out. The mouth is typical of archaic *kouroi* in that the 'archaic smile' is seen. The hair, although it follows the shape of the neck, has a beaded, wig-like appearance to it. The torso exhibits very little definition. There is little attempt to round out features such as abdominal, chest and shoulder muscles.

The sculpture, as a whole, is of a stiff appearance with the exception of the unusual position of the arms. Rather than being locked to the sides of the body, as in other archaic *kouroi*, one arm, as far as we can tell, is in front

of the body in an indeterminate position. Monumental Archaic *kouroi* normally are depicted with their arms and hands locked to the sides of the body.[51] This *kouros* has adopted a position seen more often in smaller statuettes and bronzes of the Apollo figure.

An example of a *kore* head from Miletus is Berlin 1631 dating to c. 555 B.C.[52] (see fig. 8-10), which was found near the temple of Athena in Miletus. The head is 21 cm high. The facial structure differs from that of *kourai* found in other parts of Greece. It exhibits a more prominent cheekbone and a strong chin.[53] The brow line, eyes and mouth are depicted by line rather than a modeling of these features. The shape of the eyes is unusual in that they are quite flat which give this *kore* an eastern appearance that is reminiscent of Egyptian examples. A veil completely conceals the *kore*'s hair, but that hair is indicated by the bulk underneath the veil behind the temples. This veiled style is popular in the region of Miletus and is found in relief sculpture (Berlin F724 and Berlin F725) from Didyma, near Miletus[54] (see fig, 11-12).

The best example of a *kore* body from Miletus is Berlin 1791 from the Staatliches Museen in Berlin[55] (see fig. 13-16). This *kore* is intact from the shoulders to the bottom of the plinth at 1.453 m in height. It dates to c.575-555 B.C.[56] and was found in the city of Miletus itself. Berlin 1791 is draped in a chiton with a short Ionic himation crossing the body from the right shoulder to under the left

arm. On top of the himation an epiblema is worn covering the back and the left side of the *kore*.

The folds in the garment are indicated by ridges and incision. The *kore*'s pose is stiff and frontal with the right arm adhering to the side of the body and the left forearm crossing the chest. In the left hand the *kore* holds a small bird. While the sculptor seems to have indulged himself with the detail of the drapery, the actual body of the *kore* has been neglected. The enveloping nature of the drapery leaves only the forearms and hands visible, while the shapes in the rest of the body are completely masked.

Overall the *kore* has a columnar appearance to it accentuated by the vertical folds in the chiton and the melding of the bottom of the chiton into the plinth. This is seen best in the back and profile views.

Pedley suggests that the characteristics visible in these two examples are characteristics of a 'Milesian' school of sculpture.[57] Pedley describes the Milesian style as such:

> "The Milesians preferred to emphasize the decorative effects of drapery while ignoring the body beneath, and in the treatment of the face, to use incision rather than modeling so the planes tend to meet abruptly and pictorality is stressed; for the Milesians it seems to have been only the surface that mattererd."[58]

This statement immediately brings us back to the discussion on XXVIth dynasty Egyptian sculpture. In both the Milesian sculptures and the XXVIth dynasty sculptures there is this emphasis on the surface aspects of the

sculpture rather than the character of the sculpture.

Technical similarities between the Egyptian and Milesian examples include the smoothness of the body as a whole i.e. very little definition of the feature of the body, the wig-like treatment of the hair, and the flatness of the face in the *kouros*. In the *kore* we see the enveloping drapery and the flatness in the shape of the eyes which are reminiscent of Egyptian examples.

3. Rhodes

Unlike Miletus, Rhodes did not set up a significant number of colonies for the purposes of trade and wealth but, the location of Rhodes might suggest less need to do so.[59] Rhodes geographical location is directly along major trade routes in the Mediterranean and southern Aegean seas. Rhodes, in the southern Aegean, is east of Crete and along the Mediterranean trade route which ran along the entire eastern coastline of the Mediterranean.[60] This trade network would have provided Rhodes not only with food necessities, such as grain, but also access to potential wealth through trade. As discussed in chapter two, archaeological evidence from Rhodes is most abundant in Egypt in the form of quantities of Rhodian pottery used for exporting wine and olive oil.[61] With a high level of wealth from trade and considerable evidence of contact with Egypt, it is not surprising that the influence was not one-sided, and that monumental sculpture began to appear in Rhodes by the early sixth century B.C.

The torso of a *kouros* from the Rhodes Museo Archeologico (Richter # 124) dates to 555-540 B.C.[62] (see fig 17-20). This particular *kouros* is preserved intact from the neck to the bottom of the knees at as height of 1.15 m. It was originally from the akropolis of Kamiros. The torso is flat with a minimal degree of modeling. Any definition between the features and muscles is deliniated primarily by incision. The flatness of the body is clear in the profile view. The arms are very stiff and hang down along the sides of the body with the forearms in a slightly forward position. The fists are clenched and fully attached to the sides of the upper thighs and the marble was uncut between the thumbs and index fingers in both fists. Except for the arm position, this *kouros* torso is very similar to the Milesian example (Berlin 1710) discussed above.

In general the treatment of the head sets the Rhodian *kouroi* apart from other *kouroi*. A good example is again from the Museo Archeologico in Rhodes [Richter #125[63] (see fig. 21-23)]. This head dates from 555-540 B.C. and was also found at Kamiros.

The first impression of this head is that it appears to be Egyptian. The face is badly damaged but we are still able to discern the major features. The upper and lower orbital ridges encircle the eyeball, and meet at the lateral end of the eyeball and continue to extend out parallel to the brow line which accentuates the flatness of the eyeball.

The most striking and unusual feature of the face is the mouth. The mouth is very straight and is markedly different from the usual *kouroi* faces with their archaic smiles. The impression is more of an older Egyptian noble than of an archaic Greek youth.

The structure of the hair is also unusual. The section of the wig-like hair behind the ear down along the neck is very bulky making the head resemble a square block. Normally, in *kouroi*, we do not see this accentuated bulk.[64]

For an example of a Rhodian *kore* torso we should examine Istanbul 2357 dating to 575-555 B.C.[65] (see fig. 24-27). At a height of 62 cm. it is preserved from the neck to the lower thigh region with two partial arms. This torso was originally found at Lindos. This particular *kore* is draped in a peplos dress decorated only by a belt. The lack of modeling that appears beneath the drapery gives the impression of a column with a belt. The choice of a peplos garment over the chiton and himation is unusual. While the peplos was the garment of choice for the earlier *kourai* by 575 B.C. (the date of this *kore* Eastern Greek sculptors had fully adopted the Ionian chiton, himation and epiblema in place of the peplos.[66] As a result of the drapery, the only other features visible on the *kore* are the forearms and hands only partially preserved. Both the arms and the hands are attached to the sides of the body except for a small portion of the arms adjacent to the belt of the peplos.

A Rhodian *kore* head, Copenhagen 12199,[67] (see fig. 28-31)

dates to the same time as the torso example (575-555 B.C.) and was also found at Lindos. At a height of 20 cm. this head is thought by some, including the excavator Kinch, to belong to the torso of Istanbul 2357.[68] The face is very different in appearance from our Milesian example and does not reveal any Egyptian influences. The eyes are much rounder in nature and the 'archaic smile' is very prominent. The hair on the *kore* is uncovered and wig-like in appearance with its bead-like strands. There is a fillet which encircles the crown of the head and separates the vertical bead decoration in the back portion of the hair and the wavy design of the front portion of the hair.

Egyptian influence on Rhodian sculpture is different in the *kouroi* and the *kourai* forms. In the *kouroi* a stronger Egyptian influence can be seen in the head than the body, while the situation is vice versa in the *kourai*. In the *kouros* head the flat eyeball with the upper and lower ridges of the eye extending out parallel to the brow line is characteristic of Egyptian sculpture which indicates eye make-up. Although the characteristic is visible in the Rhodian kouros it is certainly not as prominent as in earlier Egyptian sculptures. As such, it compares to the XXVIth dynasty sculptures in which the reduction of the eye make-up lines is a characteristic feature.[69] The bulk of hair behind the ear also appears to be derived from Egyptian sculpture as well. In Egyptian sculpture this massive bulk of hair is a common way of depicting Egyptian wigs.

In the body of the *kourai* we see more Egyptian influence. As indicated earlier, the use of the peplos dress in the Rhodian *kore* was unusual for this time period (575-555 B.C.), as the Ionian dress was being fully adopted by sculptors in other parts of eastern Greece, including traditionally Dorian territories such as Rhodes, and in Attica under the reign of Peisistratos (c. 560-510 B.C.) which overlaps the dates for this kore.[70] One explanation may be a result of strong Egyptian influences. The nature of the peplos is more like the Egyptian dress worm by female Egyptian sculptures[71] than the Ionic dress. Thus, in borrowing characteristics from Egyptian sculpture, the Rhodian sculptors may have found it easier to blend the Egyptian characteristics with the peplos dress rather than the Ionian dress.

D. THE IMPORTANCE OF CHRONOLOGY

An examination of the sculpture of Miletus and Rhodes also brings up the question of chronology. The earliest date for both the *kouroi* and *kourai* of Miletus and Rhodes is c. 575 B.C.[72] or the Middle Archaic Period.[73] The earliest of the archaic *kouroi* in Greece date to the late seventh century B.C.[74] but these monumental *kouroi* or *kourai* are not produced in Miletus and Rhodes at this early stage.

This fact strengthens the hypothesis of a strong Egyptian influence in the sculpture of these areas. The sculptors of Miletus and Rhodes must have been aware of these new monumental forms emerging primarily on mainland Greece at

this early stage but the lack of monumental sculpture produced in Miletus and Rhodes suggests they were not influenced by trends from mainland Greece. In this discussion the date of c. 575 B.C. is crucial. This date corresponds to the reign of Amasis. As indicated in chapter two it was at this time that the Greek merchants and traders were at Naukratis creating an economic center;[75] thus a definite trade network at that time was in place between the Greek/Egyptian settlement at Naukratis and the eastern Greek states. After this link was set up between Naukratis and the eastern Greek states of Miletus and Rhodes monumental sculpture began to appear in these two places.

E. THE ROLE OF GEOGRAPHY

In addition to the wealth mentioned earlier in this chapter , geography plays a crucial role in this transfer of artistic ideas between Egypt and eastern Greece. The original hypothesis was that relative distance from Egypt played a critical role in the amount of artistic influence Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes received from Egypt. In surveying our few existing examples the role of the geography has been proven.

Lesbos, our northernmost center showed no discernible Egyptian artistic influence in its sculptural record for the period of the late seventh and sixth centuries B.C. The fact that there is a lack of monumental sculpture from this period strengthens the hypothesis that, because of its relatively long distance from Egypt, it was less subject to

the influence or impetus to create monumental sculpture that we see in the more southerly regions.

The sculptural record of Miletus indicated a much stronger influence from Egypt. In Miletus we have examples of both male and female monumental sculpture and, in subtle ways, they portray Egyptian characteristics. However, because of its central location, Miletus is also subject to influences from several regions such as Samos, Chios, and the Cyclades, as well as Egypt so the Egyptian influences are more subtle and understated when considered in the entire context of the Milesian social and artistic reality.

As one would expect, as the southernmost region in our study, Rhodes shows the strongest and clearest Egyptian influences in sculpture, particularly as seen the heads of the *kouroi* and the bodies of the *kourai*. While the Rhodian sculpture did not go to the extent of actually copying Egyptian examples, the characteristics they did borrow are more frequently employed and more emphasized than in the Milesian examples.

The location of Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes along major trade routes from Egypt certainly played a role in the varying degrees of Egyptian influence found in the local sculptural production. In the late seventh-sixth century B.C. there were two major trade routes which linked Egypt with Greece.[78] The first of these routes began in Tyre/Sidon where Egyptian and Phoenician products came in via land routes. From Tyre/Sidon ships would sail to Cyprus

and then on to Rhodes. After Rhodes they would either sail south-west to Crete and into the western Mediterranean or north-west to Corinth and mainland Greece or north to Miletus.[77] The second trade route was a direct line across the Mediterranean from Naukratis to Rhodes; thus Rhodes was at the forefront of all Eastern Greek states in receiving products and influences from Egypt and these were then filtered northwards and westwards.

ENDNOTES

1. Boardman:1980:116; Grace:1942:343 -Greek soldiers were marching in south Egypt at this time as was recorded on the leg of one of the colossi of Ramses II at Abu Simbel c. 589 B.C.. It reads in translation: "When King Psammetichus had come to Elephantine, this was written by those who sailed with Psammetichos, son of Theokles, who went as far upstream as they could - above Kerkis. Postasimo led the foreigners and Amasis the Egyptians. This was written by Archon son of Amasiluchos and Pelekos son of Eudamos."
2. Ridgway:1977:12 -Ridgway identifies these as: the seated figure, the naked male, the draped female and the guardian animal.
3. Ridgway:1977:29-33 -These similarities are indicate later in the chapter.
4. Richter:1960:1
5. Richter:1968:1 -Sometimes the left leg can be slightly advanced and sometimes, instead of hanging down the sides of the body, one of the hands may be grasping a fold in the drapery.
6. Davis:1989:20
7. Ridgway:1977:30; Davis:1989:21-25
8. Murray:1970:27
9. Murray:1970:18
10. Schaefer:1974:313
11. Murray:1970:18
12. Murray:1970:53; Haywood:1964:133; Aldred:1980:225; Vandersleyen:1975:77
13. Haywood:1964:133-134; Grace:1942:343
14. Grace:1942:351; Levin:1964:19-27
15. Aldred:1980:226 -In some cases the cosmetic line has disappeared entirely.
16. Murray:1970:162
17. Levin:1964:21 -"On Old Kingdom statues, the face, alert and contented, offers the tempting illusion of a smile; but the smile is potential, as the mouth itself is not actually upcurved."
18. Murray:1970:161
19. Westendorf:1968:206
20. Murray:1970:162
21. Grace:1942:351; Aldred:1980:228 - During the Saite period the tomb inside the Step Pyramid (Old Kingdom) opened in order to examine reliefs and statues for the purpose of copying them.
22. Grace:1942:351
23. Boardman:1978:13 -Daedalos may be a personification of early monumental styles in Greece and Crete.
24. Ridgway:1977:19
25. Ridgway:1977:19 -footnote 3
26. Cook:1967:31; Boardman:1978:13
27. Levin:1964:20
28. Murray:1970:161-162
29. Anthes:1968:67

30. Haywood:1964:133 et al. -see above footnote 12
31. Pollitt:1972:5-6
32. Pollitt:1972:6
33. Pollitt:1972:5-6
34. Levin:1964:28
35. Lamb:1929
36. Buchholz:1975
37. Graham:1982:160-162
38. Fine:1983:125-127 -During this period there were several tyrannies which rose and fell sometimes by means of violence, primarily in Mytilene.
39. Refer to chapter two for details.
40. Herodotus II.175
41. Buchholz:1975:plate 28e
42. Buchholz:1975:plate 28e
43. Du Ry:1969:177
44. Graham:1982:160-162
45. Strabo XVIII.801-802; Herodotus II.178; Austin:1970:36-40
46. Graham:1982:160-162
47. Cook:1982:213
48. Cook:1982:213
49. Richter:1960:112; Blumel:1964:plates 169-176
50. Richter:1960:112
51. Richter:1960:1
52. Richter:1968:59, plates 293-295; Pedley:1976:plates 41 a-c.
53. Ridgway:1977:96 -The prominent cheekbones and strong chin are typical of Milesian kourai.
54. Pedley:1976:plates 42 a-b, 43 a-b; Richter:1968:plates 296-300.
55. Richter:1968:47, plates 190-193; Pedley:1968:plates 40 a-c.
56. Richter:1968:47
57. Pedley:1976:57-59
58. Pedley:1976:58
59. Graham:1982:160-162
60. Demargne:1964:326
61. Refer to chapter two for details
62. Richter:1960:109, plates 365-368
63. Richter:1960:110, plates 373-375
64. Richter:1960:110
65. Richter:1968:52, plates 249-252
66. Richer:1968:6
67. Richter:1968:53, plates 246-247
68. Richter:1968:52
69. Aldred:1980:225
70. see footnote 66
71. Ridgway:1977:29
72. Richter:1960 -All kouroi examples belong to the Melos group c.555-540 B.C.; Richter:1968 -Kourai examples date to either the Cheramyes-Geneleos Group c. 575-555 B.C. or the Lyons Kore-Ephesos Group c. 555-535 B.C.
73. Richter:1980:63

74. Richter:1960:30 -Sounion Group c. 615-590 B.C. Note: There is strong evidence for Egyptian influences on Attic and Cycladean sculpture in this period c. 615-590 B.C., however the influences are a result of different factors which are outside the scope of this thesis
75. Cook:1937:227
76. Demargne:1964:326
77. Demargne:1964:326

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

As a result of external military pressures and the need for new sources of food, the Greeks of Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes, ventured beyond their borders. This expansion eventually led them to Egypt.

Eastern Greek expansion into Egypt began in 664 B.C. with a call to arms to aid the new pharaoh of Egypt, Psammetichus I, in winning control over all of Egypt in exchange for land. Soon after the Greek merchants and traders followed, settling, primarily in Naukratis in the western Delta region. The Greek mercenaries were stationed in garrison towns, such as Daphnae, in the eastern Delta. When Amasis ascended the throne (c. 570 B.C.) of Egypt, all Greek merchants were concentrated into Naukratis, the center for trade between Greece and Egypt.

From Greece came silver, wine, oil, and pottery in which these items were transported in exchange for Egyptian corn, papyrus, and linen. However, the fascination of the Eastern Greeks with the older Egyptian culture resulted in artistic ideas being exported into Greece as well. One of the forms in which Egyptian influences manifested themselves was in monumental anthropomorphic sculpture.

In examining monumental sculpture from Miletus and Rhodes, particularly in the *kouroi* and *kourai* forms, we see Egyptian influences in posture, hair design, in the features of the eyes and mouth, and in the rendering of the body and/or drapery; each region displaying a certain aspect or aspects

of the Egyptian XXVIth dynasty style.

More importantly, each region displayed a different degree of Egyptian influence which is a result of their relative distance from Egypt. Lesbos, in the north, exhibited no discernible Egyptian influence in their sculptural record while Miletus, located further south in its central coastal region, showed its influence from Egypt with the presence of monumental sculpture with subtle Egyptian features, the most prominent feature being the kore eyes. Rhodes, lying closest to Egypt, was the port to which Egyptian commodities would land first on their way to other Eastern Greek ports. This translated into kouroi and kourai which show the strongest influence of all the eastern Greek states. This being said we should not forget that we are dealing with a very small sample of sculptures and this makes it difficult to consider the findings here as hard facts until more archaeological material becomes available.

The Material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 1: Front view of the torso of Psammetichus I c. 664 B.C. in the Brooklyn Museum no. 58.95
(Bothmer:1960:plate 22, no. 25)

Figure 2: Green schist head from a statue of King Amasis c. 560 B.C.
(Aldred:1980:plate 46a)

Figure 3: Archaic statuette head from Methymna
(Buchholz:1975:plate 28e)

The Material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 4: Profile view of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 46a)

Figure 5: Front view of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976: plate 46b)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 6: Front view of head of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen
(Pedley:1976:plate 47a)

Figure 7: Profile view of head of Berlin 1710 in Staatliche Museen
(Pedley:1976:plate 47b)

Figure 8: Right profile view of Berlin 1631 in Staatliche Museen
(Pedley:1976:plate 41b)

Figure 9: Left profile view of Berlin 1631 in Staatliche Museen
(Pedley:1976:plate 41c)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 10: Front view of Berlin 1631 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 41c)

Figure 11: Front view of Berlin F724 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 42b)

Figure 12: Front view of Berlin F725 in Staatliche Museen (Pedley:1976:plate 43b)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 13: Back view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen
(Richter:1968:plate 190)

Figure 14: Left profile view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen
(Richter:1968:plate 191)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 15: Right profile view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen
(Richter:1968:plate 192)

Figure 16: Front view of Berlin 1791 in Staatliche Museen
(Richter:1968:plate 193)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 17: Front view of Richter #124 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1969:plate 365)

Figure 18: Back view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 366)

Figure 19: Left profile view of Richter #124 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 367)

Figure 20: Right profile view of Richter #124 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes (Richter:1960:plate 368)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 21: Front view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes
(Richter:1960:plate 373)

Figure 22: Profile view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes
(Richter:1960:plate 374)

Figure 23: Back view of Richter #125 from Museo Archeologico in Rhodes
(Richter:1960:plate 374)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 24: Back view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 249)

Figure 25: Left profile view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 250)

Figure 26: Right profile view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 251)

Figure 27: Back view of Istanbul 2357 from Archaeological Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 252)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Figure 28: Back view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 244)

Figure 29: Left profile view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 245)

Figure 30: Right profile view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 246)

Figure 31: Front view of Copenhagen 12199 from National Museum
(Richter:1968:plate 247)

Figure 32: Illustration of Ionic Dress
(Richter:1968:plate III a,b)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restriction.

Map 1: Map of Lower Egypt (from: Ancient Egypt: A Social History. by B.G. Trigger et al. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1983. fig. 4.2 p. 290.)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Map 2: Map of Eastern Greece (from: Atlas of Classical History. by Richard J.A. Talbert. Routledge, London. 1985. p.47.)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Map 3: Map of Eastern Aegean and the Asia Minor Hinterland (from: Atlas of Classical History. by Richard J.A. Talbert, Routledge, London. 1985. p. 33)

The material on this page has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Map 4: Map of Egypt, the eastern Mediterranean and the Near East (from: Ancient Egypt: A Social History. by B.G. Trigger et al. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1983. fig. 4.1. pg. 285)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, M.M. Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society. University Printing House, Cambridge. 1970.

Blumel, Carl. Die Archaische Griechischen Skulpturen der Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin. 1964.

Boardman, John. Greek Sculpture: The Archaic Period. Oxford University Press, New York. 1978.

Boardman, John. The Greeks Overseas. Thames and Hudson, London. 1980.

Bothmer, B.V. Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100. The Brooklyn Museum. Arno Press, Inc., Brooklyn. 1969.

Buchholz, Hans-Gunter. Methymna : Archaologische Beitrage zur Topographie und Geschichte von Nordlesbos. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz. 1975.

Coldstream, J.N. Geometric Greece. Ernest Benn Ltd., London. 1977.

Cook, J.M. The Greeks in Ionia and the East. Thames and Hudson, London. 1962.

Cook, J.M. "Greek Settlement in the eastern Aegean and Asia Minor: vol. 11, Chapter XXXVIII of Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1964.

Cook, J.M. "The Eastern Greeks". Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1982.

Cook, R.M. "Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt". Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. vol. 62 pp. 227-237. 1937.

Cook, R.M. "Ionia and Greece in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C." Journal of Hellenic Studies. vol. 66. pp.67-98. 1946.

Cook, R.M. "Origins of Greek Sculpture". Journal of Hellenic Studies. vol. 87 pp. 24-23. 1967.

Davis, Whitney. "Egypt, Samos, and the Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture". Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. vol. 67. pp. 61-81. 1981.

Davis, Whitney. The Canonical Tradition in Ancient Egyptian Art. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1989.

Demargne, Pierre. Aegean Art. trans. Stuart Gilbert and James Emmons. Thames and Hudson, London. 1964.

Diodorus. LOEB Classical Library. trans. C.H. Oldfather. William Heinemann Ltd., Cambridge, Mass. 1983.

Drews, R. "The Earliest Greek Settlements on the Black Sea". Journal of Hellenic Studies. vol. 96. pp. 18-31. 1976.

Dunham, A.G. The History of Miletus. Univeristy of London Press, London. 1915.

Du Ry, Carel J. Art of the Ancient Near and Middle East. Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York. 1969.

Fine, John V.A. The Ancient Greeks: A Critical History. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1983.

Grace, Frederick R. "Observation on Seventh-Century Sculpture". American Journal of Archaeology. vol. 46. pp. 341-359. 1942.

Graham, A.J. "The Colonial Expansion of Greece". Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1982.

Gunn, Hiscombe. "Notes on the Naukratis Stela". Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. vol. 29. pp. 55-59. 1943.

Haywood, Richard M. Ancient Greece and the Near East. Vision Press Ltd., London. 1964.

Herodotus. LOEB Classical Library. trans. A.D. Godley. William Heinemann Ltd., London. 1960.

Hogarth, D.G. "Excavations at Naucratis". The Annual of the British School at Athens. vol. 5. pp. 26-97. 1898.

Huxley, G.L. The Early Ionians. Faber & Faber, London. 1966.

Kees, Hermann. Ancient Egypt: A Cultural Topography. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1961.

Lamb, W. and R.W. Hutchinson. "Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos". British School at Athens. vol. 30 pp.1-52. 1928.

Milne, J.G. "Trade Between Greece and Egypt Before Alexander the Great". Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. vol. 25. pp. 177-183. 1939.

Murray, Margaret A. The Splendor that was Egypt. Readers

Union, Sidgwick and Jackson, London. 1951

Pedley, John Griffiths. Greek Sculpture of the Archaic Period: The Island Workshops. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz. 1976.

Petrie, W.M.F. "The Discovery of Naukratis". Journal of Hellenic Studies. vol. 6. pp. 202-206. 1885.

Pollitt, J.J. Art and Experience in Classical Greece. Cambridge University Press., Cambridge. 1972.

Richter, Gisella. Kouroi: Archaic Greek Youths. Phaidon Press Ltd., London. 1960.

Richter, Gisella. Kourai: Archaic Greek Maidens. Phaidon Press Ltd., London. 1968.

Richter, Gisella. A Handbook of Greek Art. E.P. Dutton, New York. 1980.

Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. "Greek Kouroi and Egyptian Methods". American Journal of Archaeology. vol. 70 pp. 68-70. 1966.

Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1977.

Roebuck, Carl. "The Organization of Naukratis". Classical Philology. vol. 46. pp. 212-218. 1951.

Schafer, Heinrich. Principles of Egyptian Art. trans. John Baines. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1974.

Strabo. LOEB Classical Library. trans. H.L. Jones. William Heinemann Ltd., Cambridge, Mass. Book VII. 1917.

Talbert, Richard J.A. Atlas of Classical History. Routledge, London. 1985.

Westendorf, Wolfhart. Painting, Sculpture and Architecture of Ancient Egypt. Harry N. Abrams Inc., New York. 1968

## APPENDIX ONE

### NAMES AND DATES OF THE KINGS OF EGYPT IN SAITE PERIOD

### TWENTY-SIXTH (SAITE) DYNASTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Psammetichus I | 664-610 B.C. |
| Necho II | 610-595 B.C. |
| Psammetichus II | 595-589 B.C. |
| Apries | 589-570 B.C. |
| Amasis | 570-526 B.C. |
| Psammetichus III | 526-525 B.C. |

(from: Ancient Egypt: A Social History by B.G. Trigger et al table 4.1., p.281)

## APPENDIX TWO

When I chose the three regions of Lesbos, Miletus, and Rhodes, the choice was essentially a random one. Being a random choice, I encountered problems that I did not foresee. The root of these problems was in the lack of archaeological evidence. This was prevalent when we examined the settlement of Naukratis. We have a situation here where the excavation was done in 1898 on a site which had already been highly disturbed by modern incursions. Many of the artifacts recovered are scattered all over the world, many of them in private collections and they are not able to be analysed with the knowledge we now have about dating pottery and other artifacts. We should also consider the Greek bias in this excavation with excavators who examined the Greek quarter of Naukratis yet almost completely ignored the Egyptian quarter. With this lack of information from the Egyptian quarter of Naukratis we may have lost vital information about Egypto-Greco relations in the heart of where Egyptian and Greek products were exchanged.

Another instance where there are problems with the lack of archaeological evidence was in the examination of the *kouroi* and *kourai* from Lesbos, Miletus and Rhodes. In Lesbos there has been very little excavation done and where there has it has not focused on the Archaic period in Lesbos or has not been published. Similar problems also exist in areas which have experienced more extensive excavation such

as Miletus and Rhodes.

There has been limited numbers of excavations dealing with the Archaic period thus when we look at monumental anthropomorphic sculpture from this period we are reduced to examining two or three good examples, in comparison with the hundreds from Attica.

The inherent problem with such a small sample is that it becomes increasingly difficult to do any type of study on the general characteristics of a particular region.